DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 007 EC 103 998

AUTHOR Genser, Lillian, Ed.
TITLE Understanding and Responding to Violence in Young Children.
INSTITUTION Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich. Center for Teaching About Peace and War.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 52p.; Papers were originally presented at a conference on "Understanding and Responding to Violence in Young Children" (Preschool through Grade 5) April 12, 1976; The publication was made possible by a grant from the Peter Gran Peace Education Fund
AVAILABLE FROM Wayne State University, Center for Teaching About Peace and War, Detroit Council for World Affairs, 5229 Cass Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48202 ($1.75)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; Early Childhood; Emotionally Disturbed; *Social Factors; *Socially Deviant Behavior; *Violence

ABSTRACT

Presented are proceedings from a 1976 conference entitled "Understanding and Responding to Violence in Young Children" which was attended by over 600 students, teachers, child care workers, and parents. Following an introduction by L. Genser are entries with the following titles and authors: "The Course of the Development of Violence in Young Children" by E. Callard, "Socialization Processes Affecting Violence in Society--What are the Prospects for Change?" by M. Wattenberg, "Violence and the Social Order" by H. Ravitz, and "Workshop Report--Where Do We Go from Here?" by W. Innerd. Among conclusions offered by each contributor are that the research indicates that the infant is not born violent and there is no innate drive toward hostile aggression and that the reality of violence in our society is the major cause of violence in young children. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED152007

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Understanding and Responding to Violence in Young Children

Compiled, edited, and
with an Introduction
by Lillian Genser

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lillian Genser

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

The Center for Teaching About Peace and War
Wayne State University • Detroit • 1976

EC103998

These papers were originally presented at a conference on "Understanding and Responding to Violence in Young Children" (Preschool through Grade Five), April 12, 1976, sponsored by The Center for Teaching About Peace and War, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202.

Copyright © 1976 by The Center for Teaching About Peace and War, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202.

Publication was made possible by a grant from the Peter Gran Peace Education Fund.
The Fund was created by the estate of the late Peter Gran to support peace education projects and publications.

CONTENTS

Introduction 5
Lillian Genser

The Course of the Development of Violence in Young Children 7
Esther D. Callard

Socialization Processes Affecting Violence in Society: What are the Prospects for Change? 23
William W. Wattenberg

Violence and the Social Order 35
Mel Ravitz

Workshop Report--Where Do We Go From Here? 43
Wilfred Innerd

Conclusion 49

About the Contributors 50

Sponsors 52

INTRODUCTION

Lillian Genser

In 1966, the Center for Teaching About Peace and War was established at Wayne State University to encourage the study and teaching of peace and war and to develop new approaches to solving both domestic and international conflict. From its inception, an ongoing concern for the Center has been the rising tide of domestic violence. To begin to understand this development, in 1971 the Center and Wayne State University's College of Education co-sponsored a Summer Convocation on "The Effects of War and Violence on Children." Participating psychiatrists Dr. Joseph Fischhoff and Dr. Frank Parcells of the Wayne State University Medical School and Dr. Derek H. Miller of the University of Michigan warned that "being the victim of war and violence or growing up in a country that sanctions them leads a child to be a perpetrator of war and violence."

As a follow-up effort to further understanding of the problem, the Center in cooperation with Iona College, University of Windsor, and the Consortium on Peace, Research, Education, and Development conducted a two-day peace research and educational conference, "Antidote to Violence," at Wayne State University, October 12 through 14, 1972. Here we were introduced to Galtung's concept of institutional or structural violence (1) --violence exemplified by the ghetto baby bitten by a rat in its crib; or the emotionally ill teenager drowning in the oceans of red tape in seeking help from the social service system; or the unemployed worker (too old at fifty) whose plant was decreed no longer efficient to operate. These are instances of covert violence caused by the systems and policies that dehumanize human beings until they accept humiliation and injustice without hope.

1974 brought the end of the Vietnam war and the hope that now at last we could turn our priorities to the severe problems

at home. However, the war had ravaged our nation financially as well as morally and spiritually, but the badly needed resources were never forthcoming. The desperate needs of our children and their parents have been ignored. As an accompaniment to the recession that followed the end of the war, we are experiencing a rapid escalation of violence in our cities not only by the adult population, but what has become shockingly evident, by the very youngest of our children.

In April 1975, a Senate subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency in a survey of 516 schools found that between 1970 and 1973, assaults by students on students increased 85% and on teachers 77%. More recent statistics show that in 1975, American students committed 100 murders, 12,000 armed robberies, 9,000 rapes, 204,000 aggravated assaults against teachers and other students, and the annual cost of vandalism to taxpayers is almost 600 million.

In September 1975, we decided to devote Center resources to tackle the problem in greater depth. Plans were begun for a conference to be scheduled during the month of April 1976.

Esther Callard, professor of Human Development and Relations, Wayne State University, and Center executive board member, volunteered to research the Course of the Development of Violence in Young Children.

Mel Ravitz, director, Detroit-Wayne County Community Mental Health Board, was invited to consider the Relationship of the Social Order to Violence and Crime. And William Wattenberg, professor of Educational Psychology, Wayne State University, agreed to deal with Socialization Processes Affecting Violence in Society.

A Planning Committee was formed. Jesse Kennedy, director, Center for Professional Growth and Development, College of Education, Wayne State University, agreed to chair the conference, and J. Edward Simpkins, dean of the College of Education, accepted the job of closing the conference with a challenge: Where Do We Go From Here? Wilfred Innerd, professor of Education, became responsible for coordinating the workshops focusing on family and peer groups, preschool, school, and media.

Eight months later on April 12, 1976, at McGregor Center, the conference, "Understanding and Responding to Violence in Young Children," was held. Over 600 students, teachers, child-care workers, and parents attended. This publication is our way of sharing the procedures with you.

Note:

1. For additional information, please refer to Johan Galtung's article. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research*, No. 3:167.

THE COURSE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF VIOLENCE IN YOUNG CHILDREN

Esther D. Callard

The child is not born violent. It is necessary to state this because in our American culture we tend to attribute violent intent to the most innocent acts of children if their acts bring *us* discomfort. This fact was first brought to my attention by the noted anthropologist, Dorothy Lee. At one of the Merrill-Palmer Institute's first infant conferences, she commented to a group of students that it came as a great shock to her to hear American mothers refer to their babies in the womb as "kicking." In her native land of Greece, the first movements of the baby in the mother's womb were referred to as "quickening." She was so curious about this that she investigated numerous other languages and found that without exception words for this early movement indicated either a neutral action--such as "moving"--or they had a playful connotation, such as "frolicking" or "gamboling"--as a lamb. Dorothy Lee believed that it was typical of the competitive-based American society to attribute such a hostile, aggressive motive as that implied by the word "kicking" to the innocent fetus' first sign of viability.

There is an important point to be made here. In this article, when I speak of the "violent" behavior of young children, I am not speaking of their natural, assertive, exploratory movements. The infant spontaneously gums the mother's breast--mothers often call this biting and react as if they had been deliberately attacked. He grasps and pulls our hair--we usually react as if he had intended to do battle with us. As a toddler, he engages in rough and tumble play. He builds structures and knocks them down with a crash.

Later he chases and captures and tussles in cowboy and Indian roles.

If we label and react to this early form of social and manipulative play as if it were intended to hurt us and to destroy our property, we will discourage a vital process, through which the child learns and develops. If our reaction is condemning and punitive, we forge the first link in a process of reaction and counter-reaction which places us in an adversary position with the child. Most of the behavior of the young child comes under the heading of such exploratory play and social interaction. It may be noisy, messy, disruptive and rough, but it is not violent, nor is it necessarily a prelude to violence.

For the purpose of this article, I am defining violence as intentional, hostile aggression. It is aggression which may be instrumental in the sense of achieving a goal (getting a toy from another, claiming a spot on the Junglegym, banishing a playmate from the doll corner). Or it may be, as far as we can determine, hurtful for the sake of being hurtful, destructive for the sake of being destructive--a discharge of rage.

This definition is consistent with that of Feshbach's (8) "hostile aggression" or McGrew's (14) "agonistic behavior"--that behavior which results in injury or flight of other children—unlike what he calls "quasi-agonistic" behavior which, like rough-and-tumble play, tends to stimulate further contact.

Among my questions: Is there an innate drive toward hostile aggression? Are some populations of peoples inherently more violent than others? Are some children within each society predisposed toward violence by virtue of genetic or biological characteristics? Compelling and complicated questions. For the purposes of this article, I will deal with them in this perfunctory fashion.

Most present-day ethologists, who have observed animal behavior in natural settings, tend to conclude with W. C. McGrew that "no empirical evidence, either physiological or psychological, has ever been presented for the existence of an 'aggressive drive' in Homo sapiens" (14:5).

Even those who cling to a theory of aggressive-drive stress the existence of corresponding affiliative drives. Lorenz ends his often-cited volume, *On Aggression*, with this paragraph:

> We know that, in the evolution of vertebrates, the bond of personal love and friendship was the epoch-making invention created by the great constructor when it became necessary for two or more individuals of an aggressive species to live peacefully together and to work for a

> common end. We know that human society is built on the foundation of this bond . . . (13:299).

Eibl-Eibesfeldt correspondingly summarizes in the last chapter of her volume, *Love and Hate*,

> The disposition toward intolerance and aggression is certainly innate in us, but we carry no mark of Cain upon our brows. The thesis of man's killer nature cannot seriously be upheld; on the contrary investigation shows that by nature we are also extremely friendly beings (4:245,246).

As for the predisposition toward aggression among various populations, there is some recent evidence that activity levels of the newborn are lower for Oriental children, that physical development is more precocious among African infants (10). If one can argue some relationship between physical activity at this early age and a proclivity toward violence, there could be, potentially, a predisposition. Such a relationship has not been established.

In an important longitudinal study of early reactivity patterns of infants and later behavioral outcomes, high activity levels in the early months failed to indicate relationship to later behavior problems (20). In fact, there was a small group of children who were identified as "difficult," due to their early temperament (someone labeled them "the mother-killers"). The children were somewhat more apt to manifest later behavior disorders than children labeled "easy," but the crucial factor in their adjustment appeared to be the nature of the interaction they experienced with caregivers.

Abundant evidence exists that this early interaction differs from culture to culture and from the moment of birth. Dr. Frederick LeBoyer, in his film and volume, *Birth Without Violence* (12), describes the nonviolent birth which, in some societies, still prevails. He asserts that our brightly-lit obstetrical room practices, holding the infant by the heels, slapping him on the back, bathing him, wrapping him in a blanket and removing him from the mother is not only a violent assault on the newborn's senses, but may create basic anxieties which predispose him to the development of violence later.

Prescott (18) is another popular advocate of the close physical contact between infant and mother. He adds cross-cultural studies of adult patterns of aggression to his theoretical argument, claiming that there is a positive relationship between the amount of physical affection, such as fond-

ERRATUM

9

Page 9, second line from bottom: substitute negative for positive.

ling, caressing and playing with the baby and the incidence of violent behaviors, such as theft and killing, in the adult society.

My personal observations of children in Asia led to my original interest in this subject of early socialization. Like Benedict and Mead, the anthropological authors I consulted, my husband and I found that the preschoolers we observed in Japan, in Hong Kong, and in Thailand contrasted sharply with those we were accustomed to in the United States. In our report, published in *The Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* of 1959, we concluded that although the Asian children

> exhibited much activity and aggression . . . it was aggression . . . that was kept under control by the child himself. There was rarely any open display of hostility. Seldom did any play "get out of hand" so that an adult had to intercede. Dependable controls seemed to reside within and emanate from the individual child, giving appropriate direction and limitation to his aggression (3:186).

We identified three major child-rearing conditions that developmental theory would suggest as having a potential for causing these differences in the children. The children in present-day China were correspondingly nonviolent and many of the same conditions prevail in the People's Republic that we found in Hong Kong, Thailand, and Japan years ago.

1. *Gratification in infancy.* The basic needs of the infant were abundantly and ungrudgingly satisfied. He was held in close contact by the mother, nursed on demand, his cries responded to immediately. Since he suffered little of the frustration which could engender angry, retaliatory feelings, the Asian preschooler came into a nursery school situation with relatively little need to express hostility or rebellion.

2. *Obedient culture.* The ideal of the society was uniformly that of the cooperative, obedient, nonviolent member of the group. The renegade or dissident, the overly-aggressive person was not a hero, unlike our country where there is a great deal of ambivalence regarding the value of passivity versus rebellion.

3. *Sense of worth.* Compared to competitive societies in which the young child is bound to be a liability because he is a non-contributor and depleter of resources, the Asian child was encouraged to participate at his own level and expected to contribute to the well-being of the household. At a program of the American College of Psychiatrists in 1971, Dr. Louis West described the culture of the Tarahuma Indian of

Mexico as singularly free of aggression and violence. He found their pro-social behavior to be rooted in this sense of each man's value to the survival of the group. He says

> the importance of the child in the survival of the family is crucial. The rate of infant mortality is high and each child is cherished and valued. The Tarahuma don't beat their children; they avoid inflicting pain, and never deliberately deprive a child of anything necessary to his security or satisfaction. Yet their children are remarkly well-behaved (22:157).

I find American audiences amused, if not shocked, when I describe the nursery school children in China actually having tasks such as separating screws for factories. It is emphasized in the People's Republic of China that this is real work, that the child's work is a needed contribution to the nation. This may be more symbolic than real, but if it is, it furnishes a symbol to the child that reinforces his sense of worth as a part of his community. In our industrial society, it is hard to find any economic value in a child's contribution. We can still demonstrate his value to us through our pleasure in his presence and our delight with his small accomplishments: his block structures, his scribbles, his conversation.

To understand why these conditions (gratification in infancy, nonviolent models and a sense of worth and identification with the adult community) could be crucial variables in producing the pro-social, rather than the violent personality, one must place the phenomenon of violence in a developmental perspective. Like any other behavior, violence is rooted in the biological system of the species: its development follows a course dictated by the maturational sequence of the human organism and depends upon the nature of the reciprocal interaction between this organism and its environment. May I repeat my opening statement: *The child is not born violent.*

However, the infant comes into the world equipped with reflexive responses to noxious stimuli or signals of threat; his startled reflex upon hearing a loud or sudden noise or upon feeling a loss of support; his thrashing, kicking, screaming response to physical discomfort. He is innately programmed to sense certain threats to his own well-being and to react in ways that bring help or ward off danger. That is to say, the newborn comes equipped with a repertoire of survival behaviors. Although these behaviors are neither hostile nor loving, they have the potential of becoming either. The thrashing arms of the neonate can become socialized into the clasping close of the nurturing parent or the slashing out against the hurtful other.

During the first months of life, the infant's hunger pangs, sensations of cold, wetness, fatigue, can become associated with gratification and relief at the hands of a consistent, responsive caregiver, leading him to anticipate body relief or pleasure even as he experiences discomfort. Thus, there is set up in him an overriding sense of well-being. If his hunger and cold and other body discomforts are prolonged and severe, with no regularity of response from a nurturant other, his primary psychological state may well be one of anxiety, if not terror. Each beginning pain is the signal, not of coming comfort, but of growing discomfort. He can begin to feel comfortable and good--or he can begin to feel anxious and angry. This is the crucial dilemma of the infant's first year, in the formulation of Erikson (5), to develop a sense of trust or a sense of distrust in his existence.

If there is in the infant's life one or more responsive, nurturing caregivers who ensure his development of trust, he forms an attachment to them and they become potent forces in his socialization. He behaves in ways to keep them near him. He characteristically shows distress at their disappearance, joy at their return. Mothers and infant caregivers in a nursery may feel upset at the signs of a seven-month-old's attachment, calling the child spoiled, blaming themselves for permitting overdependence. In reality, this sign of attachment is a signal of healthy emotional adjustment. The situation to cause alarm is the one in which attachment fails to develop.

In Ainsworth's (1) extensive research on attachment, she has utilized a standard procedure for measuring the dimensions and variables surrounding the phenomenon. In one procedure, the crawling infant is left alone in a room, his mother placing him on the floor and then going out of the door. Characteristically, the infant creeps to the door and sits there, sometimes crying, looking after the departed figure. Then the mother returns and the baby stretches its arms to be held, clinging to the mother, often burying its head on her breast.

In a report on Ainsworth's studies at the 1975 Society for Research in Child Development conference, Marjorie Main (15) described one small group of infants who did not respond in this manner. When the mothers left the room, these babies failed to show the distress and figure-following typical of other babies. More significantly, upon the mother's return, these infants averted their gaze from her, often turning their backs and actually creeping away from their mothers. Marjorie Main labels these actions "avoidance behaviors."

She found that the mothers of these infants differed from the total sample of mothers in that they showed higher levels of anger, dislike for physical contact, and rejection of the baby between nine and twelve months of age. They also were

characterized as possessing what Main calls an unusual lack of facial expression in response to their infants.

These babies who exhibit such avoidance behavior at twelve months, by the time they are twenty-one months differ from the other babies in having higher scores on tantrum behavior, hitting and banging toys in non-exploratory ways and attacking the mother during the play session. It may be hypothesized that these mothers' lack of expression and responsivity, their anger and rejection, results in a general lack of responsiveness and inattention to the child's basic needs. And so the child, failing the responsive nurture, does not form the attachment which, as we have noted, is the potentially potent tool of socialization.

The most closely-attached infants and their nurturing mothers cannot hope to escape the trials and tensions of the toddler period, when the child is out to own the world yet lacks the personal controls and the discriminatory functions to manage the freedom he so stoutly demands.

During the toddler stage the child is into everything--pulling things off shelves, flushing them down the toilet, painting them with lipstick, mixing them with syrup. It's the time when the parents in our country are driven up the wall. Controls are emerging but are far from reliable--he moves over to the carpet and bangs his head on the floor in a temper tantrum. He begins to bite your finger when you are trying to force his shirt over his neck--then he may turn and bite his shirt or himself instead. He places his hand on the phone receiver, looks at you, and says, "No, no, no"--you sigh with relief. He's finally caught on--then he picks up the receiver and turns the dial. You give up. He's learning--but feelings of autonomy and self-assertion are strong, judgment and controls weak, while reasoning power seems nonexistent. So, it's easy to say, "All he understands is a good slap." You also realize that slapping him provides him with a model you don't want him to emulate. What to do? It is truly a time of walking a tight-rope. The metaphor is not only graphic, it is prophetic; we have a long way to fall if we lose our balance. Research indicates that severe punishment at this stage of development may actually be the forerunner of the very hostile aggression we think we are prohibiting: on the other hand, the love-oriented technique which is more effective in preventing this aggression relies on the instilling of guilt, which may lead to other serious and maladaptive psychological behaviors.

It is not easy to play it cool and avoid getting so upset we resort to one extreme or the other. We get so *tired* of it! In our American society we lack the multiple mothering of the extended family, which can help to diffuse and spread the in-

tense and constant interaction between toddler and caregiver. And our society sets such store by the *things* that the toddler messes up or destroys. Why can't we simply clear the decks of all except the essentials and the nondestructibles and let the toddler explore to his heart's content? Because, for one thing, we have to live there, too. For another, as in the case of the attached infant, we fear that this is *indulgence* that we will *spoil* the toddler if we clear the coffee table of cigarettes, matches, and candy. He must learn not to touch! May I point out that our society leads virtually all others in the severity of the early demands we place on children (23). Perhaps it is part, again, of our competitive philosophy--the earlier the better. However, development follows maturation, and the toddler is not ready to exhibit reliable controls. True, he must not be allowed to hurt or destroy, but our denials and expectations should be patient, consistent, and gentle--not unreasonable, erratic or violent. Otherwise, we will be nourishing the very same kind of anger and hostility we are displaying. Research is clear on this: harsh physical punishment is commonly found in the background of overly-aggressive children (6:6,3,7,11). For example, one clear finding has emerged from the studies of the antecedents of child abuse (9:13C). Abusing parents tend to have been abused as children. It was not beaten *out* of them--it was beaten *in*.

We mentioned earlier the potent force which close caregiver-child attachment can exert in the later socialization of the child. At this toddler stage, the child who has developed this attachment appears able to accept the everlasting restrictions of the parent without undue feelings of frustration. He can accept even the parent's occasional anger without panic. He is motivated by a desire to please, to maintain closeness, to avoid causing the parent unhappiness or anger. We can say he is empathetic and that he is beginning to internalize the values and rules of the parent. They become his values and rules and he begins to have a conscience.

The emerging conscience of the preschool child can clearly be seen by any nursery school teacher. This is when children label themselves and each other. "He's a bad boy . . . Am I a good girl?" They tattle, they preach, they recite the rules. Not only is the child conscious of what he is doing, he is beginning to be able to exert controls in a reliable fashion. Now, for the first time, we can rightly speak of the violent child. His actions *can* have intentionality. He can do things deliberately.

In the nursery school, we certainly do see behavior that seems like hostile aggression. There is danger, however, in labeling any individual child as a hostile or violent child. Stigmatizing and defining children in terms of negative stereo-

types at this age is both premature and contraproductive. With this caution firmly in mind, it may still prove helpful to examine the various violent behaviors exhibited by three- and four-year-olds, to try and analyze the dynamics underlying their behavior, and indicate appropriate responses based on these dynamics.

My personal observations and records have led me to identify some general categories that tend to correspond, interestingly, to groups found by Ross Stagner (19) in a recent study of junior high school students in an attitude survey.

The first group I describe corresponds to what Stagner calls children possessing "alienated aggression." In his sample of older children he finds the attitude that society is hostile and threatening and authority figures are out to get you. At the preschool level one could translate this as--"Get out of here; leave me alone, give it to me." These children see a threat, not a promise, in the approach of another, be it playmate or adult. They constantly defend themselves, their possessions, their territory from what they obviously perceive as a noxious interference. Furthermore, they do not trust anyone to protect them or intercede on their behalf. They flail out, attacking and resisting before they give anyone a chance to prove his friend or enemy status. Everybody is the enemy.

At the same time, the demands of these aggressive children are apt to be excessive. They want *more* space, more toys, more rights than any playmates or adults can reasonably grant them. They tend to be insatiable and unwilling to submit to any deprivation. Thus, the caregiver is compelled to play out the very model of non-nurturance that he is trying to dispel.

What can we do about these non-trusting, alienated children?

We can give them all the gratification possible, holding them, listening to them, building on any tentative bridges of contact they allow. We can accept without a sense of personal affront their rejection of our well-intentioned approaches, realizing the nature of their distrust and the slow process by which it can be overcome. We can also try to reduce the threats in the environment, providing ample space, plenty of toys and equipment. We can place the child in a small group of children who are the same age or younger.

At the same time we must not allow violent behavior to work for him. While our means of stopping him need not be harsh or punitive, we must be firm and consistent. Only thus can he really learn to trust us. Once this trust begins we are in a position to provide him with alternative ways of behaving, acting as his interceder--before he strikes out or

destroys, speaking for him, reflecting his wishes, sharing his feeling. We can then suggest that he "share" instead of usurping, "ask for" instead of seizing, say "stop" instead of retaliating.

Dealing with the distrustful preschooler is difficult; progress is slow. Yet we have all seen the mature, knowledgeable, caring adult work "magic" with such needful, unhappy children, gradually turning them from their aggressive, hurtful exchanges with their playmates to cheerful, cooperative play.

A second category of hostile, aggressive children contrasts sharply with the above. These children are, if anything, over-socialized. They are what I have heard Dr. Wattenberg describe as pseudo-social, and appear to correspond to the junior high students that Stagner found exhibiting "peer group conformity." At the preschool level we find some children already using violence in order to gain peer-group status. As you know, the peer group phenomenon can begin in the nursery school, particularly among the older four-year-olds. A clique, usually male, may, indeed, terrorize a nursery school and the violent child, by doing the "dirty work," may gain acceptance in this clique. His behavior, in turn, stimulates and acts as a model for the others.

What are the dynamics underlying the behavior of this peer-attached child? I have found no research to answer this question which is actually based on studies of very young children. Extrapolating, however, from studies of delinquency, we can surmise that the personality formation that these children exhibit may conform to that of youthful gang members engaging in violent anti-social behavior. These children often show a history of being street children, pushed out of the house at an early age, finding their "parents" in the older kids, the leaders of the street gang. Although they may appear to be without a conscience, their superego is actually based on the group mores. When the peer group says "O.K.," these children hear "good boy."

How does the teacher cope with violent anti-social children?

Should adults in this situation intervene, or should they step back and trust that the hurtful, destructive behavior will be negatively received by the group and the violent child will get his comeuppance from his peers? Remember, the preschool age is the age when the child is beginning to sort out "good" and "bad." Playmates use each other to get feedback from the authority figures. The vulnerable child who has not developed the close parental ties and had close parental guidance conducive to the development of a strong conscience may become

the scapegoat of the group. His playmates may use him to play out the "bad" roles, gauging reactions without jeopardy to themselves.

If we as adults stand by, failing to stop the anti-social behavior, the children consider it sanctioned. If, however, we consistently aim our reprimands at the one child who is the most aggressive, we join the scapegoating drama. We can stop the behavior without targeting in and victimizing any one offender.

There is an optimistic note regarding the violent child who is trying to gain peer-group affiliation. His hunger for such affiliation can be redirected and he can become pro-social through identification with a non-delinquent group. Possibly, at this young age, we can also work through the parents or with child guidance personnel to help the child find a deep relationship with an adult, a relationship through which he can build appropriate self-referral and reasonable levels of guilt for his own anti-social acts.

There is a third type of child whom we occasionally find in our nursery school, who quite definitely needs more help than we can usually provide. This child does not act for group approval, in fact, his violence is apt to be surreptitious, irrational, and it definitely sets him apart from other children. They fear and distrust him. He may make unprovoked, hurtful attacks on others, exhibit cruelty, often to animals, and show a complete absence of concern for what he has done. It seems that he is playing out some fantasy, his behavior has so little instrumental value or relevance to the situation. Again, Stagner identified these respondents in his survey, calling their attitude neurotic and their aggression free-floating. Fortunately, this behavior is extremely rare. It is also so idiosyncratic that one can make no generalization regarding appropriate response except to recommend that parent and child be referred for therapy.

How does the teacher deal with these atypical children in a group setting?

A word of caution. Many young children, in their testing of situations, do outlandish, sometimes hurtful, seemingly unprovoked things. As in the case of the alienated, aggressive child, respond to him with firm restraint, coupled with attempts to establish an affectional bond. Only when this fails and after considerable observation and staff consultation should referral for therapy be suggested.

I now continue the earlier discussion concerning children who are active, exploring, and impulsive and who may not as far as we can tell be operating from any deep hostility. We should not label them as violent. They don't start out, at

least, wanting to destroy or harm. But they certainly get into a lot of trouble.

These children do not fit the above categories. They do not have severe emotional problems; there is no evidence that they *need* violence to protect themselves and control others, and there is no evidence that the peer group is scapegoating them into violence. They are, however, rough and destructive; they do violate the rights of others; and they do destroy things. With them, it is more a lack of control than a controlled use of violence. Why?

They may simply be immature. Or
They may be constitutionally more impulsively ridden, more hyperactive.
They may be living in tension-producing, overstimulating environments.
They may have insufficient supervision at home or in the neighborhood.
Punishment, when it does occur, may be long after the event, or be too severe so that the residue is panic, not heightened self-control.

This is the group of children we are seeing more and more; hyped-up, over-stimulated, under-supervised and inappropriately, often harshly, punished.

What is our responsibility toward these violent-prone children?

Perhaps we cannot call them violent *now*. But if they go into our kindergartens as tough guys, trouble-makers; if they perceive adults as enemies and punishers; if they develop a concept of themselves as against parents and teachers, they will leave us violence-prone. We will have contributed to this by failing to provide the appropriate relationships, programs, controls, and reinforcement.

These children need no more from us than any good family and community should be expected to provide. You will note that I said "and community." For a good family does not "fly from the forehead of Zeus" any more than a good child does (2).

It is my thesis that the development of violence in a young child represents the failure of not only the parents, but of the total community. Although I have drawn my examples from nursery school experiences, I believe that the family is the sacred vessel for the rearing of our children. In the works of Michael Novak in his article in *Harper's Magazine* "The Family Out of Favor,"

The family is the primary teacher of moral develop-

> ment. . . . Through the love, stability, discipline, and laughter of parents and siblings, children learn that reality accepts them, welcomes them. . . . The family nourishes "basic trust." . . . If infants are injured here, not all the institutions of society can put them back together (17:46).

Few of us would disagree with the fact that social conditions, economic pressures, government policies provide more strain than strength to that family. Again in Novak's words,

> Almost everything about mobile, impersonal, distancing life in the United States--tax policies, real estate policies, the demands of the corporations, and even the demands of modern political forms--makes it difficult for families that feel ancient moral obligations to care for their aged, their mentally disturbed, their retarded, their needy (17:46).

And, I would add, even their healthy, bright, intact infants.

Let me summarize and conclude by returning to the three conditions which I suggested are requisite for the pro-social development of the young child.

First, gratification in infancy leading to affectional bonds between adult and child.

An intact family unit composed of mature, loving adults can usually provide the young child with a healthy level of gratification. Do the children of today have such mature, intact families?

> Item: The only group of women in the United States for whom the birth rate is rising are adolescents from 10 to 14 years of age (16:67).

> Item: The number of children living in families headed by women more than doubled from 1960-74. Of these families, 61% are beneath the poverty level (16:65).

> Item: The number of children under age 6 who lived in a family headed by a working mother rose by 71% from 1970-75. The median income of these women was $6,575 (16:65).

The second condition for the development of pro-social behavior is adult models which are themselves nonviolent. Pro-

social models can be found in harmonious, law-abiding families and communities. Do our children live in such families and communities?

Item: Child abuse is growing at the rate of 15 to 20% a year. Two thousand American children are killed by their parents each year; nearly a million are injured (9:13C).

Item: Of all assault cases in Detroit in 1970, 52% were between husband and wife.

We read of increased violence on our streets; we see more and more violence on television; and we are witnessing ever more serious types of violence in our schools.

The third condition is the opportunity for identification with the adult society through a sense of personal value to that society. A society that values each human being distributes its resources so that priority is given to human needs. Are we saying to a child: "You have value; you belong to us; we care what happens to you;" or are we saying "You are a burden; you are useless; be damned."

Item: The city of Detroit is forced to curtail preschool eye and hearing tests, yet our lawmakers will not pass an additional tax on liquor and cigarettes to provide necessary funds.

Item: Federal requirements for day care that would require at least one caregiver for each child under the age of three years were not upheld. Some states permit as many as twelve infants and toddlers to be cared for by one person.

Item: We protect our automobiles by requiring licensing of mechanics, while anyone above the age of 16 in good health may receive state funds as a child caregiver.

The child is not born violent. He is socialized into violence through neglect, mistreatment, and examples of violence in the world around him. The expert in child development can tell us how this socialization process takes place. However, it will take a community dedicated to human values to create the caring environment that will reverse the current trend toward an ever more violent society.

Notes

1. M. S. D. Ainsworth and B. A. Wittig. 1967. "Attachment and Exploratory Behavior of One-Year-Olds in a Strange Situation." In *Determinants of Infant Behavior, Volume IV,* ed. B. M. Foss. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
2. Urie Bronfedbrenner. 1972. "The Roots of Alienation." In *Influences on Human Development,* ed. Urie Bronfenbrenner. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dreyden Press, Inc.
3. Thomas Callard and Esther Callard. 1959. "Observations on Child Behavior in the Orient." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* Summer:185-191.
4. Irenaus Eibl-Eibesfeldt. 1971. *Love and Hate: The Natural History of Behavior Patterns.* New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
5. E. H. Erikson. 1950. *Childhood and Society.* New York, New York: Norton.
6. L. D. Eron, L. Walder, R. Toigo, and M. M. Lefkowitz. 1963. "Social Class, Parental Punishment for Aggression, and Child Aggression." *Child Development.* 34(4):849-867.
7. Seymour Feshbach. 1970. "Aggression." In *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, Volume II,* Paul H. Mussen, ed. New York, New York: John Wiley and Sons. (Third edition).
8. Seymour Feshbach. 1964. "The Function of Aggression and Regulation of Aggressive Drive." *Psychological Review* 71:257-272.
9. Vincent J. Fontana. 1976. In "Center Tries to End Child Abuse Cycle" by _. McCormack. *Detroit News* February 29; 13C.
10. Daniel Freedman. 1974. *Human Infancy: An Evolutionary Perspective.* New York, N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons.
11. R.A. Hinde. 1974. *Biological Bases of Human Social Behavior.* New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
12. Frederick LeBoyer. 1975. *Birth Without Violence.* New York, N.Y.: Alfred Knopf.
13. Konrad Lorenz. 1963. *On Aggression.* New York, N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc.
14. W.C. McGrew. 1972. *An Ethological Study of Children's Behavior.* New York, N.Y.: Academic Press.
15. Marjorie Main. 1975. Paper on Avoidance Behaviors presented to the Society for Research in Child Development Conference. Denver, Colorado.
16. National Council of Organizations for Children and Youth. 1976. *America's Children, 1976: A Bicentennial Assessment.* Washington, D.C.
17. Michael Novak. 1976. "The Family Out of Favor." *Harper's* 252(1511):37-46.

18. James W. Prescott. 1975. "Body Pleasure and the Origins of Violence." *The Futurist* April:64-74.
19. Ross Stagner. February 1976. Personal communication to Esther Callard. Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.
20. A. Thomas, S. Chess, and H. Birch. 1968. *Temperament and Behavior Disorders in Children.* New York, New York: New York University Press.
21. William Wattenberg. July 1964. Personal communication to Esther Callard. College of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.
22. Louis Jolyon West. 1972. "Discussion." In *Perspectives on Violence*, ed. Gene Usdin. New York, New York: Brunner/Mazel.
23. John W. M. Whiting and Irvin L. Child. 1953. *Child Training and Personality.* New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

SOCIALIZATION PROCESSES AFFECTING VIOLENCE IN SOCIETY: WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS FOR CHANGE?

William Wattenberg

This article concentrates on a very definite age group, that of elementary school children. So it may be worthwhile to review what is known about this particular group, as distinguished from preschoolers or adolescents.

These are the years after the major developmental events which are concentrated in the home and before those when the relationships between the sexes are salient. We are looking at children in whose lives schooling is a main force. If we were to use the schema promulgated by Erikson: the issues of trust, autonomy, and initiative have either been resolved or are well in the process of resolution. In classic Freudian terms, these young people have had their ego structures laid down, and superego formation is taking place. In the middle classes, the scene of basic formative forces is shifting from the home to the school; and from the home to the street in addition to the school among those whose parents are not supervising them.

These children are not quite old enough for the guerilla warfare with adults which characterizes the next older age group. While the power of their peer group is growing, relationships with adults are still dominant for most.

Despite the limits placed by size on their effectiveness in hand-to-hand combat, young children are capable of injuring each other. Given weapons, they can kill. More often their attacks take the form of throwing rocks, icy snowballs, or using slingshots. Many are being inculcated with the code that if they are attacked by peers, they should not come crying to adults for sympathy, but should settle the dispute by hitting, kicking, pulling hair, scratching. It is not without reason

that teacher contracts call for automatic suspension of the child when a teacher is assaulted! What we need to spend thought upon is not fantasies nor play but true violence.

In dealing with these phenomena, and discussing countermeasures, we shall focus on four basic propositions:

1. All human beings at every age when thwarted can and do react with anger and are capable of rage.
2. Whether or not this anger is expressed violently results from the interplay between its intensity and the existence and strength of behavioral repertoires of the individual.
3. As has been indisputably proven by Bandura and Sears, the models set by parents and by other real-life or pictured people strongly influence children.
4. When a society sets out to do so, it can reduce the incidence of violence, especially in children, by reducing the amount of unmet need or by modeling nonviolent modes dealing with disputes.

Let us consider how these four propositions affect children. The Miller-Dollard thesis states that frustration produces aggression; this has been challenged as an oversimplification. Pastore has shown that frustration seen as the product of basic realities may not cause rage, but when a person is seen as thwarting, that person may be attacked:

> The occurrence of the aggressive response depends on the subject's understanding of the situation. The aggressive response, when it occurs, is functional in character--that is, the response may express the subject's realization of an unjust situation or it may express the subject's attempt to secure recognition for some neglected or thwarted need (1).

As a case in point, consider the following vignette appearing in an article, "Schools That Turn People Off" by Stewart Diog (2), published in *Today's Education*.

> A classroom debate has just ended. The victor is a boy named Roger; the loser is Walter.
>
> The teacher asks Walter, the loser, if he understands why he was outscored.
>
> "I guess so," he says.
>
> "Why?"
>
> "He had more facts and organized them better."
>
> "That's true. Anything else?"

"His arguments were, well, more logical, and he had rehearsed the way he was going to do it."

"Yes, his presentation helped. I want to emphasize, Walter, that your work is not bad. It's just that you need to put a little more effort into each part of it. Understand.?"

"Sure."

Walter leaves the class with his best friend.

"That louse, Roger," he says. "He's so slick with words. He's been fooling people with his big fat mouth ever since he came to this school. I hate his guts."

Losing a contest is bad enough, but having salt figuratively rubbed into the wounds is worse. Would anyone be surprised if Walter found some way to get even with the teacher, or Roger, or both. What Walter needed was someone who could empathize with him for a while. It was the existence of unmet need that in this instance proved basic. This was brought out in Chorost's (3) study which found that in general children whose parents were low in warmth and high in authoritarian control were the ones carrying the heaviest load of hostility. The fundamental relationship has been depicted by Silverman:

> Aggression is the child's normal reaction to frustration, it is his means of letting his environment know when his basic needs are not gratified. The child who exhibits an excessive amount of aggression is not, however, in emotional equilibrium. Study of children who are excessively aggressive demonstrates that they are denied their normal needs for aggression, that their other instinctual needs are not being gratified, especially their need for affection, or that physical or physiologic pathology is present. Malnutrition, lack of rest and sleep, overstimulation, or infection frequently make a child unable to tolerate frustration (4).

Later, when the time comes to deal with the possible approaches to the problem of violence in children, we will have to ask what can be done to meet needs more completely. This is not an issue to duck. Before leaving it, however, we must foreshadow a major point which will come later, when we examine the role of adult models. The adults in a child's life have their needs. If these go unmet, the adults are more likely to have a burden of hostility which could produce in its turn violent behavior.

The second proposition has to do with the fact that there

are many ways in which children can express anger. Every society has its socialization processes by which it inculcates appropriate means of asserting oneself. However, the intensity of the hostility has some bearing on the success of nonviolent socialization or on whether, given several options, the boy or girl chooses the less violent ones. This question is given more meaning when we look at extremes. In his empirically based classification of children's problems, Jenkins labels one group as "unsocialized aggressive:"

> The unsocialized aggressive reaction tends to occur as a reaction to parental rejection coupled with some parental overprotection (5).

He is writing of the type of youngster with whom Redl and Wineman engaged themselves at Pioneer House. These are children torn apart again and again by explosive rages which prevent ordinary socialization from building solid personality structures. Tempting as it always is to dwell on such pathology, doing so would interfere with our purpose, which is to attend to the bulk of the child population.

At the other pole of the continuum are the many girls and boys who resort successfully to play and let their anger so thoroughly express itself in fantasy that they have no need to lash out at people. In her study of the interconnections of overt and covert aggressiveness, Korner sums up:

> Several types of data analyses established one fact very clearly: no inference whatsoever could be drawn regarding either the degree of the form of a child's hostile behavior in real life on the basis of observing his play. Conversely, since all the correlations between overt and covert hostile behavior were so low as to be of no predictive value, no inference could be drawn concerning the strength or direction of a child's hostile fantasies by evaluating his overt hostility. . . .
>
> The children who showed a great deal of hostility in play and very little overtly, managed and at least partially mastered their hostility by using play to give themselves an opportunity to safely evaluate causes and effects, and to restate and assimilate overpowering experiences and feelings which they would not have been able to do at the reality level. This attempt at mastery was sufficiently well accomplished in most of these children to allow them to govern them-

> selves along the lines of the reality principle, namely to choose a medium for the discharge of their hostilities least damaging to their interpersonal relations (6).

Since there really is no way of taking an accurate census, let us assume that most of our children, most of the time approximate Korner's subjects rather than Jenkins' "unsocialized aggressives." On the hunch that this is so, let us look at the socialization processes.

To oversimplify somewhat we can take the old adage, "by precept and example," and add to it a twentieth century third in combination, "by eliciting and reinforcing." These three strategies can be illustrated quickly by three parental actions:

1. A child comes home crying for sympathy because a larger child took his or her candy; the parent says, "Don't come crying around me; go back and lick the living bejabbers out of him."
2. The parents get in an argument and settle it by coming to blows.
3. The father or mother sees the child in a fight and with obvious approval delivers the verdict, "You're a chip off the old block."

To be a bit more scientific; every society establishes role definitions for its members. One device is to use words to inculcate values. The generalizations phrased in abstractions often being difficult for children, frequently these are phrased in the type of concrete operations that Piaget would declare suitable. In our society the use of force, even lethal force, to bring people to terms is so deeply sanctioned by our culture that few of us are aware of the pervasiveness of that strategy. The plagues which are vaunted in the Old Testament because they humbled pharoh culminated in indiscriminate killing of the first born to all Egyptian families, good or bad. David slew Goliath. Medieval knights, with approval, committed mayhem on each other for love and for honor. On Ivy League football fields, scholars assaulted each other, "for God, for country and for Yale." And, on Little League playgrounds, coaches teach children of both sexes to jar the ball out of the hands of basemen or catchers by sliding hard into them.

The third proposition, then, is based on the assessment that even more effective is the tactic of setting examples. At its most telling, this method is truthful when violence is visited upon a boy or girl to teach the difference between right and wrong. Parents are entreated, "Spare the rod and

spoil the child." And some of us may be aware of some schools where teachers have brought pressure to obtain approval for administering corporal punishment; or a paddle on which is carved "Board of Education" is seen dangling from a classroom desk.

There is inevitable concern not only with live exemplification of violence, but with the shadowy surrogates appearing on television programs. These have been the subject of much research. The general findings indicate, and no one need be surprised that after witnessing violence on television, children show more violence in their play. Typical of a variety of such researches is that by Chaffee and McLeon (7) who found a positive correlation between viewing of violent programs and aggressive responses to measuring instruments in surveys of seventh graders in Wisconsin and Maryland. They tracked down the effect of statements that the viewers learned from the programs and violent techniques used in the programs to handle problems.

More illuminating is the work of Roberts and Leifer reported to the 1971 Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. To measure the effects of television shows, they designed an instrument to find out the relative preference for aggression among the behavioral options available to each child. They showed films of television shows graded as to violence to sample groups of children, 4, 7, 10, 13, and 16 years old. They found that children at the older ages were most aggressive and less influenced by specific films. In a modestly worded but thought-provoking note they observed:

> The data we have, thus far, tentatively suggest that it may be the *amount* of violence in real television programs, rather than the portrayal of motives and consequences, that most influences children's subsequent choice of aggressive response (8).

What this seems to say is that before any of our children reaches puberty, she or he will have been exposed to so much violence that individual television shows no longer make much difference and, to the extent that our children are being socialized for violence, this is being done by the quality of models they see. Clearly we have no way of judging with certainty what proportion of those models are real-life people in their lives and what proportion are those shown on television, seen in movies, pictured in comics, or read about in books.

Clinching the socialization process for many of our children is the fact that when they use the violent responses elicited by the existence of models, the environments we create

reward them. In the technical terminology of Skinner, "The contingencies of reinforcement" shape violent behavior. Often this occurs in small incidents. But, the girl or boy who "sticks up for herself (himself)," who triumphs over an opponent is rewarded in enough ways so that successful assaults rise in their repertoire of responses.

What we have been picturing to this point are social forces of tremendous power. Illustrative of that potency was an experience in which a group of athletes, and myself, tried to see if we could reverse the high value of fighting among a small group of young boys who were already in trouble for aggressive assaults. The athletes, all well known to the boys, regaled them with accounts of how, in order to stay in their games, they had to curb the temptations to fight when insulted or surreptitiously injured. One basketball player said, with credibility, "If they get me out of the game on fouls it is worth twenty points to them." When the boys seemed impressed with a strategy of holding one's temper, I asked if they knew any fellows who liked to get other kids to fight but who stayed out of trouble. If so, they had experienced instigation. The next question was, "And next time someone tries to get you into a fight what should you do?" With disheartening unanimity they shouted, "Sock him!"

In the face of such episodes it is very tempting simply to call it quits. The fourth proposition in this article is that it is possible to counteract these forces and to educate for peaceful resolution of conflict.

Let us remind ourselves that this community (Detroit), the last week in January 1976, witnessed a very successful effort to handle peacefully the strong emotions which in other communities led to violence on streets and in schools when court-enforced busing began. It may be worthwhile to note the ingredients of a thoughtful, community-wide program.

First of all, and probably of key importance, those who opposed busing and who might in another community have been involved in one type of violence or another were able to find outlets for their feelings. They held meetings, made speeches, and rode in placarded caravans which were shown on television. Read, if you will, the letters published in the newspapers. There was expression of feeling; it was not suppressed.

Second, leaders were shown on television, heard on radio, quoted in the press, and seen in the pulpit, all voicing a basic precept: whether we are for busing or opposed to it we will peacefully obey the law. So powerful was this chorus, that some of the strongest organizers against busing, voluntarily assured the press and their supporters that they held those same values.

What was the effect on the elementary school children?

During the last week in January, a "command post" was established in the School Center Building in Detroit. At this center, information was collated on all incidents occurring in the city in connection with the inauguration of busing. The sources were radio contact with all buses, a Detroit Police Department switchboard, security reports from individual schools, radio communication from a unit maintained by the U.S. Department of Justice, and reports telephoned to the Monitoring Commission by sixty observers in schools. The information was detailed to the point where record was made not only of a car driven to block a bus but even of a police squad car which took a girl late for her bus pick-up point and raced her to catch up with the bus she missed.

When checked out, the total of incidents was: one case of picketing across the street from an elementary school, twenty pickets outside the School Center Building, one group of pro-busing advocates outside another elementary school, three telephoned bomb threats, twenty-three students ticketed for disruptive activity in a middle school not involved in busing, one boy involved in a fight with several others at another middle school, and one boy threatened in a shakedown at a third middle school. There were no reported episodes of student fighting at any elementary school.

Since this article was written, approximately two months later, the volume of incidents continues to be at a comparable level. There have been student distrubances at some of the high schools and middle schools. What the volume might be if security measures were relaxed is anyone's guess. However, there has been one major episode on the playground of an elementary school that did involve intruders, some of whom were of elementary school age. There have been instances of objects thrown at buses and of abusive language.

In summary, the amount of violence occurring in Detroit schools during the first months of the second semester would appear to be sufficiently below that which has come to be the norm in this city. It is far below that feared as a result of experience in other cities undergoing busing so we can state that when extraordinary efforts are made it is possible to counteract the potentials for violence on the part of children at least for short periods and in limited arenas. The fact that even this can happen offers encouragement that refusing to feel futile is more than an act of heroic optimism. Turning again to basic principles, on what basis can we construct our efforts to reverse the hitherto prevailing tide of rising violence?

First of all, even as we were able to delineate the forces and the modeling which sets the stage for violence, so too in very similar fashion could we picture psychological drives and

socialization processes which make for love, for peace, and for integrative ways of resolving conflict. Just as this group today rued the growth of violence, so, paradoxically, it is possible to hold a meeting of tough militarists who would create in each other a dismay that we are creating a nation of mollycoddles. They would be telling each other that the vaunted Marines are no longer the reliable dogs of war they were in the good old days!

Ours is a very ambivalent society. The benedictions that send us forth from our houses of worship invoke peace as the most precious of all gifts. To many people all this may sound like soft-headed sentimentality. However, it also suggests the possibility of a strategy often successfully used in behavior modification programs: one way to deal with behavior we do not want is to build up a competing, incompatible response. To the extent that we can deliberately use the socialization processes available to us to strengthen the peaceful, loving, conflict-resolving behaviors of children, we reduce the likelihood of violence on their part.

To clarify this point, let us reflect a moment on two major varieties of contest. In some games, the way to win is to directly counteract your opponent's moves. In a fight, you teach him not to fight by beating him into submission. By contrast, in a race you do not conflict with your opponent, you outdistance him. It is symbolic in a way that when two children fight, one leaves the scene hurt and crying, and frequently plans on returning to the fray at a later time, armed with new punishing skills or weapons. To use punishing techniques to counteract violence is to risk escalation. On the other hand, frequently at the end of a race, the contestants, if children, are seen laughing and panting. Winner and loser often find comforting camaraderie in mutual exhaustion.

Scientists interested in game theory make a distinction between zero sum games and cooperative games. In zero sum games, what one contestant wins, another loses; the gains and losses cancel out, their sum is always zero. In cooperative games, each player gains from the interaction; what escalates is not hurt but friendly laughter. With this in mind, let us reverse the propositions mentioned earlier as follows:

1. When their needs are met, all human beings at every age respond with smiles and are capable of love.
2. Whether or not this love is expressed results from the interplay between its intensity and the existence and strength of behavioral repertoires of the individual.
3. The models set by parents and other real-life or pictured people strongly influence children.
4. When a society sets out to do so it can increase the

incidence of love, especially in children, by increasing the amount of met need and fun, and by modeling peaceful, friendly, loving ways of settling differences.

Taking the first point, the Pentagon knows what it is doing when it urges the reduction of expenditures which would meet the needs of our children for food and for education. Some given to politically inspired snideness may wonder whether or not the President or Congress really understand what they are doing when they veto or threaten to vote against any reduction in expenditure for arms or any increase in expenditures for meeting children's needs. That combination is bound to accomplish what in effect we can all see has been accomplished by national policies in the past decade: so tremendous a surge in violent crime that our cities can be rescued only by erecting "secure" fortresses and teaching our children how to depend upon the protection of fierce dogs and firearms.

This trend can be reversed. We need day care centers, we need school lunches, we need homes where parents having economic security can enjoy their children, and in doing so create an atmosphere of affectionate fun. Our children need the experience of picnics, of playing in sand and water, and, if you will, of dancing in the streets.

Let us recall, now, that for elementary school children, the school as well as the home is a place where needs are met, and where affection can be shown. Let our educators, by whatever expenditure of will power it requires, put aside for the time being their inclination to get back at whomever teaches violence to children, and speculate on how to show once again that love for little folk which enticed them into becoming teachers. Remember way back when. . . . There are many ways in which classrooms can be made into need-fulfilling situations. Young people need to have their self-esteem bolstered, they need to be assured they can learn, they need to feel the warmth of attention.

There is a paradoxical aspect to much of this. If children are to be fully socialized, they must be constrained and thwarted to some degree. Within the home and classroom, they must share attention and affection with siblings and with peers. Of necessity, this leads to some output of aggression. This, too, must find expression. As Silverman (9) pointed out, children have a normal need for aggression. On the surface, the coexistence of love and aggression, the classic ambivalence, should spell trouble. However, the two can and often are integrated into benign rivalries and competitions. The model is the group of young people who day after day enjoy contests and games so much that even when they compete with each other, they do so knowing they want each other to return tomorrow for

a renewed contest. In essence, then, having learned to love, they need to be socialized in having fun. This, then, is the counterpoise for violence.

As with hate, so it is with love, that the behavior we see is an interplay between the intensity and the existence of a behavioral repertoire. Where love is weak and the child has no easy way to express it, we may not see it at all. Where it is strong, even in the absence of ready-made expression, it will find a way to be expressed. At lesser intensities, the existence of previous socialization may be crucial. For, just as hate begets hate in a vicious spiral, so there is circular causation to its antithesis--affection elicits affection.

Here, as with violence, it is all important that each child's world contain both real-life and make-believe models of love. For many of our children, both in our homes and in our classrooms, our major role is to exemplify affection and fun. It is important that they see us having exciting times.

On the make-believe level, the movies and television can and do aid in the socialization processes of positive emotions. In the late 1950's, I had occasion to interview boys in detention for aggressive assaults. By an overwhelming majority, they said their favorite program was "I Love Lucy." Upon questioning, Fritz Redl said that on his ward in Bethesda Navy Hospital, that was also true for his patients. His comment, revealingly, was "They are hungry for love." So, if we must question violence on television, let us also give that medium credit for the game shows, the soap operas, and the family situation comedies. When new ones appear, especially if they exemplify the values we want promulgated, let us communicate our applause.

The burden, then, of this second segment of the argument is that any society, especially our society, can socialize its children for love and fun. In our cities, we can create festivals where whole families can expansively enjoy themselves. To be sure, during periods of transition, we must realistically provide security, make sure that the hate-laden cannot be spoilsports.

To sum up: Benevolence is the antidote for malevolence. Friendly warmth and fun being incompatible with hate and violence, it behooves us to teach our children to wage peace. Each of us can aid in that socialization for fun that will compete, we hope successfully, with the socialization for violence we deplore. It can be done. Just think of what a whale of a time we can have doing it.

Notes

1. Nicholas Pastore. 1950. "A Neglected Factor in the Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis." *Journal of Psychology* 29:271-279.
2. Stephen Doig. 1969. "Schools That Turn People Off." *Today's Education* May:29-30.
3. Sherwood Bruce Chorost. 1962. "Parental Child-Raising Attitudes and Their Correlates in Adolescent Hostility." *Genetic Psychology Monographs* 66:49-90.
4. Hirsch Lazaar Silverman. 1970. "Factors in Emotional Disturbance in Children." *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis* 7:79-92.
5. Richard Jenkins. 1969. "Classification of Behavior Problems of Children." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 125: 1032-1039.
6. Anneliese F. Korner. 1951. "Relationship between Overt and Covert Hostility: Economy and Dynamics." *Journal of Personality* 1:20-31.
7. Steven Chaffee and Jack M. McLeod. 1971. Adolescents, Parents, and Television Violence. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Washington, D.C.
8. Donald Roberts and Aimee Dorv Liefer. 1971. Effects Over Age of Television-Mediated Violence on Position of Aggression in a Response Hierarchy. Paper presented to the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis, Minnesota, in April.
9. Hirsch Lazaar Silverman. 1970. "Factors in Emotional Disturbance in Children." *Scientia Paedogogie Experimentalis* 7:79-92.

VIOLENCE AND THE SOCIAL ORDER

Mel Ravitz

This article explores the complex subject of violence and the social order, and the relationships between the two.

Certainly I begin with the same bias other middle-class Americans have, perhaps the same bias as the middle class everywhere; namely, that violence is undesirable and that decisions should preferably be reached by mature reflection, reason, persuasion, argument, democratic election, plebiscite, and so on (1). Without question, none of us wants to be personally involved in using physical force to injure or abuse anyone, nor do we want to defend against such an action. Most of us view the daily newspaper reports of local, national, and international violence with varying degrees of horror and even personal apprehension, especially, if the highlighted deed occurred anywhere in our vicinity. Many of us are dismayed by the violent exploits we see on television and wish that they wouldn't be shown to our children or even to ourselves. Likewise, we wince when we read about civil wars in Lebanon, Ireland, and Angola, and the continuously precarious hostilities and terrorism that occur in the Middle-East.

Like other middle-class people, I have been taught to abhor violence. As a social scientist, I attempt to examine the social order of our own country--and we fancy ourselves a peace-loving people--yet I find clearly that our social order, like many others, is based on violence. Our country was born out of a violent rebellion as we sought to repudiate British economic and political domination (2). This very year we celebrate the Bicentennial of that particular violent episode, which we justify on the basis that its success resulted in our independence.

If we look further throughout our history, we note the

succession of wars: with Britain again in 1812, with Mexico, with Spain, with Germany, with the Axis Powers, with North Korea, and with the North Vietnamese. These acts of bloody violence cost the participants untold resources and countless lives. Nor have I mentioned the most bitter of our acts of military violence: our war between the states, wherein fellow Americans spent four horrible years killing each other in battle after battle. Not only did we experience our own civil war, but some of us revel in recounting the campaigns of that particular violence--the books on the subject number into the thousands.

Clearly, violence is not foreign to this society. We have been steeped in it from our inception to the present. War has followed war with regularity. Even if we exclude the initial war of independence, we have been at war between ourselves or with others for over 30 of our 200 years. Even the periods between wars have not been tranquil times. Unfortunately, we continue to teach violence to our children under the guise of preparation for war, while we raise our children on war games, war toys, and the general belief that if our country ever enters a war, it obviously was or would be because of unbearable provocation which justified our violent response.

Let me be clear. I am neither preaching pacifism nor arguing that we have been reckless or unjustified in our military participation. I am merely emphasizing that in a real way we have institutionalized military violence as a fundamental part of our social order. This is further evidenced by the massive military budgets we sustain each year, even to the point of curtailing other priorities like education, health care, housing, job training, and development. It is apparent that despite any protestations we may voice to the contrary, as a nation we have devoted both considerable time, energy, resources, money, and lives to the kind of violence we call war. It is a basic part of our history and therefore deeply ingrained in all of us.

As I examined our social order in search of evidence of violence, I found frequent other examples. Not all violence is military. If we define violence even in its narrowest, most popular sense, as physical force intending to abuse or injure, then we have our full share of duels, feuds, range wars, rebellions, border conflicts, gangland killings, strikes and lock-outs, police shoot-outs, domestic strife and endless other instances of homicide, including the events of almost every day and night in any big American city. Even in so-called peaceful eras, the internal violence we have provoked has been immense. It too has become part of the American culture to be recollected and recounted in story, song, and pic-

tures, and thus transmitted to succeeding generations.

If we are willing to define violence a bit more broadly to include both physical force and other acts intending to injure, abuse, or do harm to persons or property, then we have to consider slavery an act of sanctioned and institutionalized violence. It cannot be judged anything but violent, implicit and often applied, to hold an entire population in servitude and to require them to do as they are told on penalty of corporal punishment, mutilation, or even execution. That episode of our history was unquestionably a period of covert and overt oppression, which spells violence. Even after the official end of the slavery system, the behavior of the majority of white Americans toward black people has been that of rejection, discrimination, segregation, even killings. Whether physical force was used in every instance or not, the net result was and is a continuing act of violation against a whole people on the basis of their race. Certainly this institutionalized violence was not for the benefit of black people, anymore so than was our earlier systematic extermination of the Indians. When one examines our history coldly and without the usual ethnocentrism, we find that violence is omnipresent and therefore unavoidably a major strain of our culture that cannot help but influence ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren. No people ever escapes its own culture. Rather, that culture determines both the attitudes and the values a people hold, and if we are a people of violence today, it is not because of any contemporary perversity or weakness; it is simply because the events of our past have molded and patterned our thinking and actions.

As we study our past and present to understand the factors that have made us into the people we are, we must also study the way we have handled those who have been our deviants. Ours has not been a compassionate culture that understood human differences, accepted them and perhaps sought gently to reduce them. No, our response to deviation, whether in the classroom or in the community, has been to beat it into submission and conformity. Many people still use the stick to tame children both at home and in school; and we have used the flogging post, the hangman's noose, the firing squad, the electric chair, and the gas chamber to exterminate our criminals. Violence has been our response against those whom we failed to socialize to our way of thinking and acting. Our entire penal system with its barred cells, solitary confinement, and demoralization of the human spirit is an act of premeditated violence against those who should be rehabilitated and prepared for return to society.

As I conducted my exploration of American culture and its instances of violence, I was also struck by the innumer-

able kind, generous, nonviolent deeds performed daily by millions of us as we go about our everyday activities. I am not unmindful of our altruism, gentleness, or frequent acts of community service. They too are part of our culture and are indeed our saving grace.

But, the point I must emphasize is that when we look objectively at our history, we find the strands of hatred, avarice, and ignorance which combine from time to time in acts of personal and institutionalized violence. My concern is not with the individual acts of passion and personal loss of control of which any of us is capable. Nor am I interested in the particular psychodynamics of each such situation. That such personal eruptions can occur in the best regulated society is obvious. What I am concerned with are the examples of institutionalized violence: those forms and patterns that have become part of our way of life, that we have come to accept and even cherish, and that therefore are transmitted to our children as expected behavior. An honest review of our American history reveals the presence of institutionalized violence in substantial proportions.

A few references to other institutional areas may serve to emphasize the point. When we look at our economic system we find that violence has been ingrained in it from the beginning (3). What else but violence was it when we exploited men, women, and children at pitiful wages in rotten environments of dangerous, dirty mines, mills, and factories in order to enhance corporate profit? What else but violence was it when established business and industry hired gunmen and strike-breakers to terrorize and sometimes kill anyone who tried to ameliorate abysmal working conditions? What else but violence was it when attempts at unionization in every industry were met with lock-outs and murders? The entire history of the relationship between business and organized labor has been one of extreme hostility, even, in selected situations, unto the present day. Only in the last several years has the norm become one of quiet collective bargaining, and even that quiet is shattered occasionally by picketline clashes with scabs or the police. Little in the history of American business enterprise suggests "sweetness and light" as the prevailing mode for the resolution of critical economic differences. Political power, sometimes even naked violence, has been a conspicuous part of that history.

Is it an act of violence periodically to turn workers out of their jobs and expect them to subsist without employment for months . . . sometimes for years . . . and even forever? Some would argue that although physical force wasn't used to oust these workers, such action violated the dignity, humanity, and self respect of its victims and thus must be

adjudged violence (4).

Even in our homelife, violence abounds. Many of so-called jokes center around instances of physical violence between husband and wife, and the evidence of domestic homicide and assault is found at many precinct stations. Recently we have exposed instances of child abuse and severe corporal punishment in the home. These exemplify the old "spare the rod and spoil the child" adage that has been with us throughout our history.

If then violence is everywhere in our social order, not as merely aberrant personal acts by disturbed or overwrought persons, but as the institutionalized, accredited, approved, sanctioned part of our culture, all of us who live in such a social order must be affected by it. And so too must succeeding social orders. It is preposterous to assume that our children who grow up in such a social system can escape the impact of what they see and hear around them everyday. They cannot. And no matter how loud our occasional admonitions, no matter how eloquent our pleas to act reasonably rather than violently, our history is against us. Children of every generation are quick to detect the inconsistency between our words and our institutionalized actions. They learn to follow our example rather than our preachments, with the result that the whole pattern of violence is continued unto succeeding generations.

In a certain sense it is a pious gesture for us to discuss violence in young children unless we are willing to consider how we can eliminate it from our lives and culture. It is not within the scope of this article to debate whether violent behavior on the part of children is caused by innate or genetic factors or by socio-cultural ones. Evidence from other societies suggests that people elsewhere behave in varied ways depending largely on the nature of the social order and what it commands and encourages with respect to violence. Regardless of that, it is clear that our social order constrains toward violence, and if we would change that direction, we will have to undertake the enormous job of changing our culture.

Let us understand that while it is possible to change important elements of a whole culture it cannot be done overnight. It is extremely difficult to do, and there are powerful interest groups who, whatever they may say, will oppose any effort to eliminate violence from our social order. I daresay the rank and file of Americans would doubt that it could be done and would be unwilling to surrender their right to smack their wives or husbands or kids around or to hang onto their guns and knives or to cease their occasional punching of other people when the mood strikes. Further, I believe the

vested institutionalized forces would begin to assert themselves. Surely the military and the military minded in this country will not accept the least reduction of its budget, let alone any attempt to de-emphasize war as a method of resolving international disputes. Nor is it likely that in some school districts, teachers and school administrators would unanimously agree to renounce the right to blister the bottoms of their pupils should they believe the occasion warrants. And, with our high crime rate, we'll have a tough time persuading the people to abandon our present penal system, however archaic and counter productive we know it to be. It is easy enough to convene a conference on violence or to prepare a speech on the relationship of violence and the social order, but it will be unbelievably difficult, perhaps impossible, to actually alter our prevailing cultural patterns of violence. Let me suggest what we will have to do to overcome known obstacles and opposition.

With respect to war, we have been trying since our abortive involvement with the League of Nations to build a responsible world community that would end international violence. The League had limited success. The United Nations still functions and it has many achievements to its credit. Chiefly it has served to prevent regional violence from exploding into world-wide violence. But we still lack a strong supranational organization that would have the authority to settle disputes between and among nations without violence or, as a last resort, to use violence only for policing actions.

To end warfare we will have to build such a world organization, and in order to do that, we will need to share resources equitably between and among nations and encourage fair-trade agreements and otherwise engender arrangements of mutual assistance and cooperative endeavor. Divinely to be wished but most unlikely to be achieved for generations to come (5).

If we would end violence or even reduce it within our own society, perhaps the first and most difficult thing we must do is to distribute more equitably the resources of the society including its wealth, work, and power. Unemployed workers, exploited minorities, alienated youth and old people aren't likely to renounce violence so long as they are left out of a fair sharing of the goods and benefits this remarkable society is able to produce. Nor is it likely that those who hold wealth and power in the society and who decide who shall work and who shall not will agreeably surrender any portion of their possessions (6).

To reduce violence in America, we're going to have to find new ways to use government and the law to resolve dis-

putes between and among individuals and groups. Creative forms of conflict resolution without violence will have to be invented. And there will have to be a mutual willingness to employ these alternative forms of handling major and minor differences, both personal and organizational.

To reduce violence in America, we're all going to have to adopt a different attitude toward weapons of all kinds, and be willing to put them away and use them only for sport, as many other countries already do.

To reduce violence in America, we'll have to overhaul our penal system to emphasize the importance of rehabilitation and restoration of criminals to society. Our present jails and prisons need to be scrapped and different facilities should be built to allow us to get on with the essential tasks of modifying behavior and values, building trust and self confidence, and training for realizable jobs.

To reduce violence in America, we will have to change the way we relate to our children at home and in school. We'll have to provide them with better nonviolent models than we have and begin to encourage different priorities on television and in our everyday lives.

To reduce violence in America, we're going to have to establish a government of law and persuade our citizens (all of them) that such a government of law must prevail and is available to any of us to resolve grievances, or to secure appropriate redress. And to help do that we're going to have to retrain our police forces to be able to handle violent situations without resorting to violence, which has too often been the initial option (7).

To reduce violence in America will require us to remake the American experience and the American culture. It means repudiating the violence that has helped bring us this far in our national odyssey. It means building new, better, nonviolent social forms and then teaching ourselves to use them as alternatives to the fist, knife, and gun. It is an exceedingly difficult undertaking. Perhaps it cannot succeed, so monumental is the reversal of attitudes, of values, of institutions. Erik Erikson in his book, *Ghandi's Truth*, suggests where we are and how far we have to go if we would reduce violence and assure that our children will not learn it. He put it this way:

> We must face once more how far civilized man may have sunk in some respects below the animal and probably also below his early human ancestors; for it is civilized man, morality and all, who is, or has become, in Loren Eiseley's terrible phrase, "the lethal element in the universe" (8).

The immediate challenge we face is whether we can at least rise to the level of the animals. Given our current reality, that will take generations. Any gain beyond that in the reduction of violence must be considered long range, at least centuries away.

Yet, despite these difficulties, the struggle must go on. To cease our efforts to reduce violence in our lives would mean that we would sink even lower. Regardless of the uncertainty of success or the length of time it will require, we must work every day to teach by our examples the superiority of reason over violence. I don't know what we will achieve or when or whether ever, but I do know that our own integrity requires us to make the effort. Perhaps one day we will demonstrate that humans can indeed organize a social order that is able to cohere and function in meeting our needs without institutionalized violence.

Notes

1. Georges Sorel. 1941. *Reflections on Violence,* p. 74. New York, New York: Peter Smith.
2. Charles and Mary Beard. 1927. *The Rise of American Civilization,* Ch. VI. New York, New York: The Macmillan Company.
3. John R. Commons, et al. 1936. *History of Labour in the United States,* II, 374. New York, New York: The Macmillan Company.
4. Edwin M. Schur. 1969. *Our Criminal Society,* Ch. 4. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
5. Joseph Westermeyer. 1975. *Violence, in Mental Health: The Public Health Challenge,* pp. 213-216. Washington, D. C.: American Public Health Association.
6. Michael Harrington. 1968. "Is America by Nature a Violent Society?" in *Time Magazine* April 20: 112.
7. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.* 1968. New York: Bantam Books.
8. Erik Erikson. 1969. *Ghandi's Truth.* New York, New York: Norton Publishing Co.

WORKSHOP REPORT --WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Wilfred Innerd

After visiting most of the workshops and after reading the notes from all of them, I am left with several major impressions.

First, there were far more questions asked, concerns expressed, issues raised and problems defined, than there were solutions devised or answers given. There was not enough time for people to dig into the issues facing them in their particular area of interest. The issues, however, were so real and the fears and emotions expressed so deeply felt that it seems unlikely that they could have been dealt with adequately within the constraints of a one-day conference. It is as if this conference served as a means of clearing away the brushwood so that participants at subsequent conferences can get down to dealing in detail with the perceived problems.

Second, as I have already indicated, the level of concern was very high indeed. A nerve was obviously touched by the theme of this conference and the response was so overwhelming as to almost swamp the organizers. A great debt of gratitude is owed to the workshop leaders and responders. A great many examples were given of violence, both physical and psychological, inflicted on and inflicted by, both children and adults. Several participants spoke of a climate of fear and apprehension in the streets and in the schools, to say nothing of the home, which serves to generate an atmosphere of hostility and suspicion which in turn leads almost inevitably to violence. The reality of violence in our society cannot be separated from and is in fact the major cause of violence in young children.

Third, there was precious little if any seeking after

Note: Over 600 students, teachers, parents, and child-care workers participated in the conference and workshops.

scapegoats. Indeed, several groups expressed the view that scapegoating is one of the commonest sources of violence in young children. As one workshop leader expressed it, the participants "were getting to themselves, instead of copping out or pointing the finger."

Fourth, and related to the third, there was a very strong sense that any solution to the problem would come from within themselves. They were very grateful to have good resource people and there was a fair amount of informal counseling going on after the workshops were over and at lunch time. But the sense that the participants were the best resource, collectively as well as individually; that there were no easy answers to be provided by experts; and that any answer to violence would have to come from the community as a whole, prevailed.

Each group of workshops generated its own particular kinds of questions and I would like to share some of them.

Preschool

Do anger, fear, and hurt lead to violence?
Do young children understand what guns and death really are?
What can be done about violent language and activity in preschools?
How do you differentiate between active and aggressive children?
What can be done about abusive parents and abusive preschoolers?
What about parental attitudes toward violence and the encouragement of violence?
What can be done to ensure that nonviolent children have ways of dealing with violent behavior when they are not in school?
What are the effects of television on preschool violence?
How do we get children to channel and control their anger?
What is appropriate discipline for preschool children?
Is cruelty to animals a sure indication that a child is likely to be violent toward other children?

Family and Peer Group

What can be done to help parents parent effectively?
Do not all parents, at some time, need help in parenting?
How can teachers communicate with the family about children's aggressive behavior?
How can we reduce feelings of tension within families?
How can the community support one-parent families?
How can sibling conflicts be dealt with nonviolently?

How can children contribute to and feel part of both family and their peer groups?
How do we view violence? In what perspective and context?
How can we avoid having violence work for a child so that it is not a useful solution to problems?
How are children who actually observe violence on television affected by it?
What can be done to intervene in destructive cycles at home, in classrooms, and with friends?
How can destructiveness be handled in a violent environment?

School

What can be done about the problem in the schools? viz. Disorder, unrest, potential for students being hurt, schools not being conducive to learning, fear of attack by students, teachers, and parents?
Who should handle concerns over violence? Teachers or administrators?
Is there more violence among black than white children? If so, why? What kinds of violence are we now beginning to see among suburban white children?
Are teachers' attitudes toward themselves as well as their students responsible in part for the violence?
What effect does racism have on violence and violent behavior?
Why is violence in the schools growing?
What can be done to increase communication in the schools?
What can be done about parental attitudes which are reflected in violent behavior in school?
What can be done to improve the facilities and in general the quality of schools?

Media

Is there a correlation between violence in the mass media and violence in young children? If there is, what can be done about it?
What is the impact of violence in the mass media upon the community and the quality of life?
Where do we draw the line without being dictatorial or violating the constitutional freedom of the press?
What changes in our own personal freedom might have to come about in order for our society to deal with violence in the media?
How can the media be helpful in developing self-worth,

without reinforcing violent and destructive behavior?
Does violence in the media sanction violence?
What can be done about parents abdicating their responsibilities to television?

As can be seen, this is a long but not an exhaustive list, reflecting as it does the real concerns of participants. The underlying questions that were being asked are: Why is this country so violent? And can anything be done about it?

Recommendations

Each group was asked to develop some solutions and recommendations; and this they did. Again, I will deal with them group by group.

Preschool

All those who work with young children must be well versed in the principles and practices of child development.
We must understand the effects, good or bad, of child care and preschool on the behavior of children.
Parent education, from preschool on, should be mandatory and of a high standard.
Ways of helping non-aggressive children cope must be developed and disseminated.
Alternative procedures for disciplining young children which do not require physical abuse or humiliation must be made available to parents who know no other way.
Adults must be willing to step in and take responsibility for *all* children. They should not stand by when cruel or violent behavior is being perpetrated on a child.
The individual and the national conscience must be developed if we are to avoid further acts of violence.
Allow children to role play in order to act out aggression.
Verbalizing or intellectualizing behavior can prevent actual physical or psychological violence.
Psychological abuse may be more damaging in the long run than physical abuse. Therefore such schemes as parent effectiveness training which can reach out to abusive parents should be encouraged and made available to all.
Alternatives to violent behavior must be provided.
Noncompetitive games should be encouraged among young children.
Nonviolent models must be provided.
Support systems should reach all parents to help them

meet all the basic needs of their children, for example, nutritive, self-expressive, identity, acceptance.

Family and Peer Group

Teach and help parents learn about their children.
Help parents increase their sense of self-worth.
Involve parents in decisions about their children.
Mandate parent education throughout the schools.
Positive responses to aggression must be institutionalized.
Supportive people must be available to parents as well as books, articles, and other information.
Provide positive models for children to emulate.
Encourage alternative reactions to hostility.
Teach children how to interact nonviolently with each other.
Peaceful, cooperative behavior must be rewarded.
Intervention in the child-abuse cycle is necessary.
Communication skills must be taught. We need to learn how to talk to each other to promote peace, growth, cooperation, and security.
Provide resources for children to relate to outside the family.
Encourage children to share their feelings.
Redirect aggressive responses.
Try to make socialization processes consistent in both home and school environments.
Family environments need to be improved and techniques should be taught.
Need for good child care and good child laws.
Early identification of potentially violent children is needed.
Parents must be respected and receive support from the professionals.

School

Administrators and teachers need to be educated to deal with violence.
Teachers must stop bringing their individual biases into school.
Buildings should be improved. More materials made available.
The quality of education needs to be improved.
More conferences with parents might help.
Make schools more attractive and comfortable for children.

Pay more attention to children's safety and welfare.
Involve parents wherever suitable.
Have children discuss violence.
Do things with affection and love.
Give children more freedom of choice. Treat them less like prisoners.
Schools must work harder at understanding children.

Media

Confront the realities of our society.
Watch television with your children. Help them distinguish fantasy and reality.
Protest, individually, and as part of an organization, about offensive material.
Set limits and act as a model.
Consider the location and placement of television sets, radios, newspapers, and how they affect usage.
Support public television in so far as it offers a non-violent alternative.
Share with children how we deal with conflict and how we have to struggle sometimes to overcome our aggressive tendencies.
Establish priorities for activities and experiences.
Help children find activities as alternatives to watching television. In controlling television viewing, learn to say "no" and to give reasons. Insist on some outdoor play every day.

CONCLUSION

"The research indicates that the infant is not born violent and there is *no innate drive* toward hostile aggression." *--Esther Callard*

"Benevolence is the antidote for malevolence. Friendly warmth and fun, being incompatible with hate and violence, it behooves us to teach our children to wage peace." *--William W. Wattenberg*

"We're going to have to find new ways to use government and law to resolve disputes. For unemployed workers, exploited minorities, and alienated youth to renounce violence, we must distribute more equitably the resources of society." *--Mel Ravitz*

"The reality of violence in our society is the major cause of violence in young children." *--Wilfred Innerd*

"We have learned that institutional violence is a root cause of much extreme aggression and violent crime. The challenge and the responsibility before the adults in this society is to rearrange the priorities in our nation in order that we may bring about changes in our institutions to minimize covert violence and to help end structural and institutional violence in American life. Only then can we divert the precious energies of our children wasted in extreme aggression and violent crime so that they may love rather than hate, build rather than tear down, and create rather than destroy." *--Lillian Genser*

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Lillian Genser, has been director of programs, The Center for Teaching About Peace and War, Wayne State University since 1968. Actively involved in the work of the Center since 1966, she has initiated numerous peace-education projects. She is director of the "Heroes and Heroines" project, being produced under a grant from New Detroit, Inc. Recently, she was co-leader of the first Wayne State study tour to the People's Republic of China.

In 1972, she received the Human Rights Award for her work in peace education from the City of Detroit. She is married and the mother of two sons.

Esther Callard, is currently chairperson and professor of the Department of Family and Consumer Resources in the human development and relationships area. Her position involves supervising the department's infant, toddler, and preschool research and teaching laboratories. Dr. Callard is a former nursery school teacher. She is an internationally known lecturer. In 1956/1966, she served as a field expert in UNESCO, Botswana, Africa. In 1964, she was a member of the Delinquency Control Training Center.

She has published numerous articles including "Research Light on Children of Poverty" in *Offspring*, VII, No. 1 (Fall, 1965). Her research includes data on how the Detroit riots of July 1967 affected preschool children.

She is also mother of two children and grandmother of three.

William W. Wattenberg is professor of Education Psychology, Wayne State University. Dr. Wattenberg served as director of the Delinquency Control Training Center, Wayne State University from 1962 to 1965. From 1965 to 1968, he was the associate superintendent of the Detroit Public Schools. He is chairman of the Monitoring Commission to oversee desegregation implementation of Detroit Public Schools.

His publications include *The Adolescent Years*, 2nd edition (New York: Brace Jovanovich, 1973), and *All Men are Created Equal* (editor) (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1966). He is also the father of two sons.

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS (continued)

Mel Ravitz is director of the Detroit-Wayne County Community Mental Health Board. Dr. Ravitz actively participated in city government for many years both as a member and president of the Detroit Common Council. He is the author of numerous articles on urban problems and social action. He is married and the father of six children.

Wilfred Innerd is associate professor, Faculty of Education, University of Windsor. He was formerly with the College of Education, Wayne State University. His areas of expertise include early childhood education.

The manuscript was edited and prepared for publication by Alice Nigoghosian.

SPONSORS

Academy of the Sacred Heart--Primary and Lower Schools

Camp Fire Girls--Detroit Area Council

Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of Detroit

Center for Professional Growth and Development, Wayne State University

Center for Urban Studies, Wayne State University

Child Care Coordinating Council--Wayne County

Department of Family and Consumer Resources, Wayne State University

Department of Social Work, Wayne State University

Detroit Federation of Paraprofessionals--Local #2350

Detroit Public Schools

Detroit-Wayne County Community Mental Health Services Board

Friends of the Detroit Public Library

Dr. Marilyn Heins, Student Affairs, School of Medicine, Wayne State University

Merrill-Palmer Institute

Roeper City and Country Schools--Lower School Staff

U.A.W.--Southeastern Community Action Program

U.A.W.--Women's Department

United Methodist Church--Detroit Conference

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom--Detroit Chapter